



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,591	09/27/2004	Michael Burr	2006579-0272 (CTX-093DV)	5590
69665	7590	06/29/2009	EXAMINER	
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			NICKERSON, JEFFREY L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2442	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/29/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/711,591	BURR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	JEFFREY NICKERSON	2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2009.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Application No. 10/711,591 filed on 27 September 2004 as a division of Application No. 10/711,583 filed on 27 September 2004. The notice of appeal and pre-brief conference request presented on 13 May 2009, which provide arguments, are hereby acknowledged. Claims 1-30 have been examined.

### ***Response to Pre-Brief Conference Request***

2. Applicant's arguments presented in the pre-brief conference request filed 13 May 2009 have been fully considered and **are not persuasive** (see response to arguments below), and the prior grounds of rejection are maintained as set forth below. However, since the claimed invention was rejected based on the features of one or more product(s) in public use, and the evidentiary documentation cited by the examiner describing the features of the product(s) did not include the entire scope of the product(s)'s functionality as required to reject the claimed invention, *the examiner believes it would be unfair to the applicant to maintain the rejection(s) unto appeal while citing new evidentiary documentation. Therefore, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.*

Applicant is reminded that a new appeal may be initiated in direct response to this office action by filing a notice of appeal followed by an appeal brief, as the claims remain at least twice rejected.

New grounds of rejections may also appear below.

3. To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

**(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37.** The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed in the pre-brief conference request on 13 May 2009 have been fully considered and are deemed unpersuasive.

#### **Independent claims 1 and 16**

Applicant argues that several limitations found within these claims would not be rendered obvious by the combined teachings of Microsoft Windows 2000/2003 Server, ISA Server 2000/2004, and LinuxQuestions. Specifically, applicant argues that a VPN

Art Unit: 2442

client is not a user and an IP address is not a virtual host name, and, therefore, the combined teachings fail to provide for the following:

*“assigning, from a plurality of virtual host names, a first virtual host name to a first user accessing the network via a first computer...”*

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Most notably, the examiner never asserted the VPN client was a user and the examiner never asserted an IP address was a virtual host name. The examiner asserted the VPN client connection was the user. The examiner is also interpreting the term “user” as being a user account/login and not a physical human being (See 112 rejection below). Microsoft2000Server provides that VPN connection requests utilize user login and authentication when initiating a session. After the user is authenticated, the VPN connection created is associated with the user and can be assigned user-profile specific parameters (See Microsoft02: pg 8, section “Properties of VPN connections”, subsection “Authentication”; pg 10-12, section “Managing Virtual Private Networking”; pg 30-31, section “IAS Authentication”). For instance, Microsoft2000Server provides for configuring a user to be assigned a static private IP address upon connection to the VPN (Microsoft02: pg 12, paragraphs 1-3). Thus, Microsoft2000Server teaches for assigning, from a plurality of virtual identifiers, a first virtual identifier to a first user accessing the network via a first computer. Applicant’s arguments regarding an IP address not being a virtual host name are noted and unpersuasive. As is well known in the art and described in ISA01, host names resolve to IP addresses (ISA01: pg 1). Thus, ISA2000 teaches wherein a virtual

identifier is a virtual host name. The combined teachings provide for the above-argued limitation and, therefore, the rejections of these claims are hereby maintained.

Dependent claims 2-15 and 17-30

Applicant argues these claims conditionally on the arguments presented for their parent claim(s).

Applicant's arguments are ultimately unpersuasive and, therefore, the rejections of these claims are hereby maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1 and 16, these claims contain the term "user" throughout. Generally, throughout the networking art the term "user" is in reference to an instance of a user account, user session, and/or user login. Applicant alludes to this same definition in their specification, however, in recent arguments presented by the applicant it is unclear

Art Unit: 2442

whether the term is being defined as “the human being user” or as the art-accepted definition. For purposes of further examination the examiner will consider the term “user” to be an instance of a user login. Clarification is requested.

Regarding claims 2-15 and 17-30, these claims inherit the indefinite features of their parent claim(s).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-6 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the public use of the products Microsoft Windows 2000/2003 Server, as evidenced by Microsoft02 ("Microsoft Windows 2000 Server Resource Kit Internetworking Guide", 19 January 2000); and in further view of the public use of the products ISA Server 2000/2004, as evidenced by ISA01 ("Common DNS Issues in VPN Networking", 07 April 2004); and LinuxQuestions ("Multiple Simultaneous VPN Connections?").

Art Unit: 2442

Regarding claim 1, Windows2000Server teaches a method for providing a uniform network address, for a user accessing a computer on a network, independent of the computer the user is accessing, the method comprising:

obtaining a plurality of virtual identifiers, each of the plurality of virtual identifiers comprising an identifier uniquely identifying a user from a plurality of users (Microsoft02: pg 16-19, section “Remote Access VPN Connections” specifies internal/private address for VPN use; pg 18, last paragraph specifies using DHCP for internal/private IPs);

assigning, from a plurality of virtual identifiers, a first virtual identifier to a first user (VPN client connection instance) accessing the network via a first computer, the first computer having a computer IP address to connect to the network (Microsoft02: pg 8, section “Properties of VPN connections”, subsection “Authentication”; pg 10-12, section “Managing Virtual Private Networking”; pg 30-31, section “IAS Authentication”);

using the first virtual identifier assigned to the first user for network communications of the first user (Microsoft02: pg 8, section “Properties of VPN connections”, subsection “Authentication”; pg 10-12, section “Managing Virtual Private Networking”; pg 30-31, section “IAS Authentication”; Microsoft02: pg 12, paragraphs 1-3).

Windows2000Server does not teach:

wherein the virtual identifier is a host name;

associating the first virtual host name of the first user with a first IP address, the first IP address communicated via the first computer;

performing the above for a second user accessing the network via the same computer.

ISAServer2000, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the virtual identifier is a host name (ISA01: pg 1); associating the first virtual host name of the first user with a first IP address, the first IP address communicated via the first computer (ISA01: pg 1-2 provides for VPN clients having an internal DNS host name).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of ISAServer2000 for using DNS in a VPN environment. The teachings of ISAServer2000, when implemented in the Windows2000Server system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to use hostnames in a VPN environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of ISAServer2000 in the Windows2000Server system in order to use hostnames in the VPN environment.

The Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000 system does not teach performing the above for a second user accessing the network via the same computer.

LinuxQuestions, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches it is possible to have more than one simultaneous VPN connection running from the same VPN client computer. Thus, LinuxQuestions teaches performing the above for a second user accessing the network via the same computer (LinuxQuestions: pgs 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of LinuxQuestions for starting multiple

Art Unit: 2442

simultaneous VPN connections from a single computer. The teachings of LinuxQuestions, when implemented in the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000 system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to create simultaneous VPN connections from a single client machine, each connection having a unique internal IP and hostname. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of LinuxQuestions in the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000 system in order to allow a multiple users to VPN from a single computer.

Regarding claim 2, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein step (a) further comprises obtaining a plurality of IP addresses for assigning unique IP addresses to each of the first user and the second user (Microsoft02: pgs 9 provides DHCP is possible for assigning internal IPs to VPN client connections; See also Microsoft02: pg 10, section “Managing Virtual Private Networking”, subsection “Managing Addresses and Name Servers”).

Regarding claim 3, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein step (a) further comprises obtaining at least one of the plurality of IP addresses from a DHCP server (Microsoft02: pgs 9 provides DHCP is possible for assigning internal IPs to VPN client connections; See also Microsoft02: pg 10, section “Managing Virtual Private Networking”, subsection “Managing Addresses and Name Servers”)).

Art Unit: 2442

Regarding claim 4, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein step (a) further comprises reserving at least one of the plurality of IP addresses for at least one of the first user and second user (Microsoft02: pgs 9 provides DHCP is possible for assigning internal IPs to VPN client connections; See also Microsoft02: pg 10, section “Managing Virtual Private Networking”, subsection “Managing Addresses and Name Servers”).

Regarding claim 5, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein step (d) further comprises associating the first IP address with the first virtual host name (ISA01: pgs 1-5 provide for DNS hostname mapping in a VPN environment).

Regarding claim 6, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein step (c) further comprises associating the second IP address with the second virtual host name (ISA01: pgs 1-5 provide for DNS hostname mapping in a VPN environment).

Regarding claims 16-17, these system claims correspond to the method claims 1-2, respectively, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 18, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein the server assigns, from the plurality of IP addresses, a first IP address

Art Unit: 2442

for the first user, and a second IP address, different from the first IP address, for the second user (Microsoft02: pgs 9 provides DHCP is possible for assigning internal IPs to VPN client connections; See also Microsoft02: pg 10, section “Managing Virtual Private Networking”, subsection “Managing Addresses and Name Servers”).

Regarding claims 19-21, these system claims correspond to method claims 3-5, respectively, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

9. Claims 7-9, 14-15, 22-24, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the public use of the products Microsoft Windows 2000/2003 Server, as evidenced by Microsoft02 ("Microsoft Windows 2000 Server Resource Kit Internetworking Guide", 19 January 2000); in view of the public use of the products ISA Server 2000/2004, as evidenced by ISA01 ("Common DNS Issues in VPN Networking", 07 April 2004); and LinuxQuestions ("Multiple Simultaneous VPN Connections?"); and in further view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 7, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches the VPN client having access to the internal DNS server.

The Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions does not explicitly state registering with the DNS.

An official notice is taken that such use of registering with DNS servers was well known in the art at the time the invention was made by one of ordinary skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize any known DNS utilization techniques including registering because it would have enabled practicing the system.

Regarding claim 8, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches wherein the name resolution service comprises one of a DNS and a WINS (ISA01: pgs 1-5).

Regarding claim 9, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system does not teach wherein the virtual host name identifies one of a session of the user or a program used by the user.

An official notice is taken that such use of a virtual hostname to identify the VPN client connection was well known in the art at the time the invention was made by one of ordinary skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate virtual hostnames with internal IPs and therefore be capable of identifying the VPN client connection because it would have enabled practicing the system.

Regarding claims 14 and 15, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system does not teach naming the at least one of the plurality of virtual host names with

a portion of characters representing the user's identity on the network and attaching a suffix identifying the session when the user is concurrently connected.

An official notice is taken that such use of the above hostname naming was well known in the art at the time the invention was made by one of ordinary skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any naming convention of virtual hostnames because it would have enabled practicing the system.

Regarding claims 22-24 and 29-30, these system claims correspond to the method claims 7-9 and 14-15, respectively, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

10. Claims 10-11 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the public use of the products Microsoft Windows 2000/2003 Server, as evidenced by Microsoft02 ("Microsoft Windows 2000 Server Resource Kit Internetworking Guide", 19 January 2000); in view of the public use of the products ISA Server 2000/2004, as evidenced by ISA01 ("Common DNS Issues in VPN Networking", 07 April 2004); and LinuxQuestions ("Multiple Simultaneous VPN Connections?"); and in further view of VelocityReviews ("Assign Static IP to a VPN user").

Regarding claim 10, the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system teaches resolving host names internal IP addresses in a VPN environment thereby supporting assign hostnames to VPN clients.

The Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system does not teach further comprising the virtual hostname following the first user from the first computer to a second computer and being associated with the second computer.

VelocityReviews, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches assigning VPN users an internal IP from a static IP pool (VelocityReviews: pg 1-5). Thus, if a user ended their VPN session on a first computer and started one on a second computer, they would be assigned the sole internal static IP of the pool. If this internal static had an associated DNS hostname it would resolve back to the user's static IP and for communications with the second computer it would be encapsulated and therefore associated the second computer's public IP (See Microsoft02: pgs 16-19, section "Remote Access VPN Connections" for VPN packetizing).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of VelocityReviews for using static IP pools when assigning internal IPs to VPN users. The teachings of VelocityReviews, when implemented in the Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to assign VPN users a static internal IP, associated with an internal hostname. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of VelocityReviews in the

Art Unit: 2442

Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions system in order to manage VPN users effectively.

Regarding claim 11, this claim contains limitations corresponding to claim 10 for a second user and therefore the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claims 25-26, these system claims correspond to the method claims 10-11, respectively, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

11. Claims 12-13 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the public use of the products Microsoft Windows 2000/2003 Server, as evidenced by Microsoft02 ("Microsoft Windows 2000 Server Resource Kit Internetworking Guide", 19 January 2000); in view of the public use of the products ISA Server 2000/2004, as evidenced by ISA01 ("Common DNS Issues in VPN Networking", 07 April 2004); LinuxQuestions ("Multiple Simultaneous VPN Connections?"); and VelocityReviews ("Assign Static IP to a VPN user"); and in further view of Pirot et al (US 6,856,676 B1).

Regarding claim 12, the

Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions/VelocityReviews system teaches resolving host names to internal IP addresses, assigned from a static IP pool, in a VPN environment thereby supporting assigning hostnames to VPN clients.

The Windows2000Server/ISAServer2000/LinuxQuestions/VelocityReviews

system does not teach further comprising assigning, while the first user accesses the first computer, a third virtual hostname to the first user accessing a second computer and associating the third virtual hostname with an IP address of the second computer associated with the first user.

Pirot, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches allowing simultaneous user logins to a VPN from different computers (Pirot: col 11, line 41 – col 12, line 21). Therefore, if a user were to have a static IP pool of multiple internal IPs (VelocityReviews: pgs 1-5), each associated with a internal hostname resolved via an internal DNS server (ISA01: pgs 1-5), the user could start a VPN connection on one computer and receive a first static IP and associated hostname, and, go to a second computer and start a VPN connection and receive a second static IP and associated hostname.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Pirot for allowing and limiting simultaneous VPN connections per user. The teachings of Pirot, when implemented in the above system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to allow and limit a maximum number of simultaneous VPN connections per user. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Pirot in the above system in order to allow users to move from one computer to another and start VPN connections without ending their connection to a reasonable amount.

Art Unit: 2442

Regarding claims 27-28, these system claims correspond to the method claims 12-13, respectively, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

***Citation of Pertinent Prior Art***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Seo (US 7,536,463 B2) discloses a SIP user registration system.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY NICKERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 9:00am - 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. N./  
Jeffrey Nickerson  
Examiner, Art Unit 2442

/Andrew Caldwell/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2442